

Appln. No. 09/676,398
Response dated Oct. 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2004
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0005 (554)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of August 26, 2004 (Office Action). This response is filed in conjunction with a Petition to Revive an Unintentionally Abandoned Application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b). The Examiner is authorized to charge all appropriate fees, including any fees for necessary extensions of time, to Deposit Account 50-0951.

Claims 1-6, 1-15, 19-26, 29-33, and 36 were rejected at page 2 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,343,399 to Yokoyama, *et al.* (hereinafter Yokoyama) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,812 to Knoll, *et al.* (hereinafter Knoll). Claims 7 and 17 were rejected at page 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama in view of Knoll as applied to claims 1 and 11, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,177,685 to Davis, *et al.* (hereinafter Davis). Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama in view of Knoll as applied to claim 1 and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,932 to Ohmura, *et al.* (hereinafter Ohmura). Claims 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama in view of Knoll as applied to claim 11 and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,881 to Trovato, *et al.* (hereinafter Trovato). Claims 27, 28, 34, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama in view of Knoll as applied to claims 26 and 32, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,285,317 to Ong (hereinafter Ong).

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 11, 20, 25, 26, and 32 to emphasize certain additional aspects of Applicants' invention. Dependent Claims 16, 17, 21, 23, and 24 have been amended to provide proper antecedent bases. Claims 38-49 are newly presented. The amendments and newly-presented claims are supported throughout the Specification, as discussed herein. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 8, line 23 – p. 9, line 3; p. 9, lines 14-21; p. 9, line 22 – p. 10, line 8; p. 11, lines 19-22; p. 12, lines 13-17.) No

Appln. No. 09/676,598
Response dated Oct. 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2004
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0005 (554)

new matter has been introduced by virtue of the claim amendments or the newly-presented claims.

Claims 1-10 and 25

Independent Claims 1 and 25, as already noted, were rejected as unpatentable over Yokoyama and Knoll. Applicants respectfully submit that the references, neither alone nor in combination, teach or suggest every feature of independent Claims 1 and 25, as amended. Neither reference teaches or suggests, for example, a touch screen display that iteratively displays a first display that presents a menu of driver-selectable destination categories that each correspond to a predefined geographic region, or a second display that, in response to a selection by the driver of at least one destination category, presents a list of destinations corresponding to the at least one destination category selected. The references, accordingly, also fail to teach or suggest a storage device that includes stored information about a location of a desired driver action in which the location is based upon a destination selected from the list of destinations.

Yokoyama provides a menu screen on a display unit, but it does not present a menu of driver-selectable destination categories. The screen in Yokoyama allows a driver to control the presentation of a voice guidance output, but affords no opportunity for the driver to view different selectable destination categories, as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 25. (Col. 4, lines 55 – Col. 5, line 63.) Knoll provides an input device that can be a graphic input pad or digitized panel that includes a map-scale switch, which normalizes the map and travel route to a common scale. (Col. 5, lines 25-38.) Knoll does not provide a touch screen that presents a menu of driver-selectable destination categories, as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 25. The other references similarly fail to teach or suggest this feature. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that amended independent Claim 1, as well as Claims 1-9 which depend from Claim 1, and amended independent Claim 25 define over the prior art.

Appln. No. 09/676,598
Response dated Oct. 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2004
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0005 (SS4)

Claims 11-19 and 20-24

Independent Claims 11 and 20 were also rejected as unpatentable over the combination of Yokoyama and Knoll. Applicants respectfully assert that neither reference, alone or combination, teaches or suggests each of the feature of independent Claims 11 and 20, as amended.

Neither reference, for example, teaches or suggests displaying on a windshield of a vehicle a virtual image of an area around a desired location, wherein the image includes one or more landmarks that each have at least one attribute that changes as the vehicle moves in relation to the at least one landmark, as recited in amended independent Claims 11 and 20. Of the references, Knoll is cited in the Office Action as providing a heads-up display. Knoll, however, does not display a virtual image or picture of an area around a location, but only travel routes and maps. (See, e.g., Figures 9 and 11-13.) The displays in Knoll are merely those comprising "nodes or junctions" that are "connected by straight lines." (Col. 5, lines 62-64; see also Figures 8, 9, and 11-13.) Although the nodes and junctions provided in Knoll can "characterize intersections [and] landmarks," Knoll does not provide a virtual image of the area around a location or destination.

Figure 1 of Ohmura, cited in reference to other claims, includes a heads-up display on a windshield. As with Knoll, however, Ohmura fails to teach or suggest providing a driver with a virtual image of an area around a location or destination.

Ong, also cited in connection with other of the claims, does display a virtual image of a "local scene," which can be in a three-dimensional format or that of an actual picture. (Col. 3, lines 31-36; Figures 7 and 8.) Ong explicitly teaches, however, that a three-dimensional image "only shows the actual roadways and not other objects" so as to provide the view with "a clutter free" display. (Col. 6, lines 10-17.) Thus, in contrast to Applicants' invention, Ong does not teach or suggest providing an image that includes at least one landmark. Ong, moreover, does not teach or suggest that at least one attribute

Appn. No. 09/676,598
Response dated Oct. 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2004
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0005 (554)

of a landmark shown in the virtual image changes as a vehicle moves in relation to the landmark, as explicitly recited in amended independent Claims 11 and 20.

Applicants respectfully maintain that whereas the references, alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature recited in amended independent Claims 11 and 20, the claims define over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully maintain that whereas Claims 12-19 and 21-24 each depend from one of the amended independent claims, these dependent claims likewise define over the prior art.

Claims 26-31 and 32-36

Independent Claims 26 and 32, as amended, each recite displaying a picture on the windshield of a vehicle so that the driver can see the picture while looking out the windshield. Moreover, as explicitly recited, the picture includes one or more images of a landmark each of which exhibits at least one attribute that changes as the vehicle moves relative to landmark. Of the references, only Ong provides for displaying a picture of a location on a windshield of a vehicle. (See Figure 8.) Ong does not, however, teach or suggest that any landmark images in the picture exhibit one or more attributes that change in as the vehicle moves in relation to the landmark.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the references, alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature of independent Claims 26 and 23, as amended, and that the claims define over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully submit that dependent Claims 27-31 and 33-36, which each dependent from one of the amended independent claims while reciting additional features, also define over the prior art.

Newly-Presented Claims 37-48

Newly-presented Claims 37-44 each depend from amended independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that, for the reasons already stated, amended independent

Appln. No. 09/676,598
Response dated Oct. 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2004
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0005 (554)

Claims 1 and 11 define over the prior art and that Claims 37-48, which each depend from one of the amended independent claims and recite additional features, thus also define over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 14, 2004



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Marc A. Boillot, Registration No. 56,164
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000